many non-consultant grades will be expected to pass it as part of higher training in the specialty in the United Kingdom. It would be interesting to have some figures on the number of candidates anticipated in the near future and how this will affect the examination mechanism.

The Apothecaries Diploma Board rejected viva voce examinations some time ago as being prone to bias. This is consistent with much current research on examination techniques.[1] Oral examinations are regarded as being inherently biased and of poor inter-examiner reliability. How much, however, is this also a candidate number related phenomenon? With courses for small numbers, such as the Diploma in Venereology and Genito-urinary Medicine of Liverpool University, we find the viva a key mechanism to discriminate between candidates precisely because the examiner can adjust the level of difficulty of questions to the ability of each candidate. The viva is a good instrument to measure clinical thinking, ability to take a sexual history, and counselling. Role play need not be uniquely the province of actors. The viva is particularly useful for borderline candidates—for example, those who are disadvantaged in essays which are notoriously dependent on proficiency in English (not to mention handwriting!). In order to reduce interexaminer variation inherent in the viva, all candidates for the Liverpool Diploma are viva'd independently by both sets of (two) examiners. Clearly, this would be extremely cumbersome and time consuming for the current and anticipated numbers taking the Apothecaries Diploma.

The venerable Apothecaries' Hall is apparently "unsuitable" for projecting slides a convenient way of basing a clinical skills/data interpretation type examination for a large number of candidates—for example, MRCP Part 2 and many other postgraduate medical examinations. Will the examiners of the Apothecaries Diploma have to begin to think of more appropriate premises for their examination?

HUMPHREY BIRLEY
Department of GUM Royal Liverpool University Hospital, Liverpool L7 8XP, UK

1 Esmail A, May C. Oral exams—get them right or don't bother. *BMJ* 2000;**320**:375.

Detection of chlamydia on meatal swabs

EDITOR,—The advent of ligase chain reaction (LCR) and other DNA technologies and their greater sensitivity[1] has allowed the possibility of taking samples other than from the urethra in men, including urine samples.[2–5]

Although urine samples have the advantage of being collected non-invasively, the sensitivity of LCR tests on such samples is less than for urethral samples.[2] This may be due to the presence of inhibitors in urine.[6] The reduced sensitivity on urine samples may be unacceptable, particularly if testing populations with a high prevalence of chlamydia infection. Furthermore processing of urine samples is more laborious.

It is currently recommended that specimens for the detection of genital *Chlamydia trachomatis* infection by LCR are taken 2–4 cm from the urethral orifice and the swab rotated for 3.5 seconds.[7] Many men are unable to tolerate this. It is often painful and may discourage patients from seeking medical attention.

A pilot study was conducted to compare the sensitivity of LCR testing for genital chlamydial infection in men, taken from the meatus itself against the standard technique.

All male patients attending the GUM clinic over a 3 month period were included in the study if they had symptoms or signs compatible with chlamydia, or if a contact of a known case of chlamydia. A swab was taken from the urethra in the standard fashion. A second swab was taken from the meatus. After the sixth week of the study the order of the first and second swabs was changed, in order to evaluate any bias related to the order of the swabs. Specimens were processed using Abbott Laboratories LCx Chlamydia and handled according to the manufacturer's guidelines.

Twenty five patients were asked to evaluate the swabs and to state which swab caused least discomfort or if there was no difference between them. A total of 208 men were recruited to the study. The overall prevalence of genital chlamydia infection in our population was 25% (52/208). A confirmed diagnosis was made if both of the samples performed from the same man were positive for chlamydia, or if one sample was positive together with an equivocal result. There were no false positive tests using these criteria giving all methods a specificity of 100%.

There was no significant difference in detection rates between the subgroups where the order of swabs was changed.

There was no significant difference in the sensitivity of samples taken from the meatus (100%) or from deep within the urethra (96.2%). Of the 25 men questioned two (8%) felt that the meatal swab caused more discomfort; 19 (76%) had a strong preference for the meatal technique. Only four men (16%) stated the swabs were similar in terms of discomfort.

A meatal swab for the detection of chlamydia is more acceptable to patients and has a similar sensitivity to the traditional technique of urethral sampling

Urine samples, although non-invasive, are less likely to yield a positive diagnosis compared to urethral/meatal swabs and require extra processing by laboratories.

In a high prevalence setting (such as a sexual health clinic), the meatal technique provides a specific, highly sensitive, and well tolerated sampling method for the detection of chlamydia infection in men.

Further studies to confirm our findings in symptomatic, and asymptomatic, chlamydia infection are needed before introducing this technique as routine clinical practice.

Contributors: HL, principal investigator and author; SMM, investigator and edited final draft; JLD, data collection and obtained clinical specimens; MSS, investigator and processed specimens.

H LAMBA
J L DAVIES
S M MURPHY
Patrick Clements Clinic, Central Middlesex Hospital, Acton Lane, Park Royal, London NW10 7NS, UK

M S SHAFI
Department of Microbiology

Correspondence to: Dr H Lamba, St Mary's Hospital, Praed Street, London W2 1NY, UK

1 Stary A, Tomazic-Allen S, Choueiri B, *et al.* Comparison of DNA amplification methods for the detection of Chlamydia trachomatis in first-void urine from asymptomatic military recruits. *Sex Transm Dis* 1996;**23**:97–102.
2 Carroll KC, Aldeen WE, Morrison M, *et al.* Evaluation of the Abbott LCx ligase chain reaction assay for detection of Chlamydia trachomatis and Neisseria gonorrhoeae in urine and genital swab specimens from a sexually transmitted disease clinic population. *J Clin Microbiol* 1998;**36**:1630–3.
3 Stary A, Najim B, Lee HH. Vulval swabs as alternative specimens for ligase chain reaction detection of genital chlamydial infection in women. *J Clin Microbiol* 1997;**35**:836–8.
4 Chernesky MA, Lee H, Schachter J, *et al.* Diagnosis of Chlamydia trachomatis urethral infection in symptomatic and asymptomatic men by testing first-void urine in a ligase chain reaction assay. *J Infect Dis* 1994;**170**:1308–11.
5 Hook EW 3rd, Smith K, Mullen C, *et al.* Diagnosis of genitourinary Chlamydia trachomatis infections by using the ligase chain reaction on patient-obtained vaginal swabs. *J Clin Microbiol* 1997;**35**:2133–5.
6 Berg ES, Anestad G, Moi H, *et al.* False-negative results of a ligase chain reaction assay to detect Chlamydia trachomatis due to inhibitors in urine. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis* 1997;**16**: 727–31.
7 Abbott Diagnostics Division. Package Insert for LCx™ Chlamydia.

Accepted for publication 8 March 2001

HIV positive and negative homosexual men have adopted different strategies for reducing the risk of HIV transmission

EDITOR,—To reduce the risk of HIV transmission, some homosexual men have adopted a strategy whereby they only have unprotected anal intercourse (UAI) with a person of the same HIV status (known as "concordant UAI").[1] In London, homosexual men *in a relationship* are more likely to know the HIV status of their UAI partner than men not in a relationship[2] and so establish concordance. However, this was not examined for HIV positive and negative men separately. A survey conducted in January-February 2000 among homosexual/bisexual men attending one of six gyms in central London, as part of an ongoing behavioural surveillance programme,[2 3] has allowed risk reduction strategies to be considered by HIV status. A total of 792 homosexual men (median age 35 years) completed a confidential questionnaire (estimated response rate 50–60%[2 3]); 126 (16.0%) were HIV positive, 477 (60.2%) HIV negative, while 169 (21.3%) had never had an HIV test (data missing for 20 men). Just over half the men (55.2%) said they were currently in a relationship with another man; this did not differ significantly by HIV status (p=0.1).

Our analysis focused on how sexual risk behaviour varied both by HIV as well as by relationship status. For HIV negative and positive men, UAI was classified as either concordant (UAI with a partner of the same HIV status) or non-concordant (UAI with a partner of unknown or discordant HIV status). Men reporting more than one UAI partner were classified as concordant only if all UAI partners were of the same HIV status as themselves. Men also indicated whether they had had UAI with a main partner only, casual partner(s), or both. One third of all men (32.9%, 259) reported UAI in the previous 3 months; HIV positive men 42.1% (53/126), HIV negative 34.7% (165/475, data missing for two men) (p=0.1). Overall, concordant UAI was reported by 18.7% (89) of HIV negative and 21.4% (27) of HIV positive men (p=0.4). For HIV negative men, concordant UAI was predominantly reported by those in a relationship and rarely by men who were not (28.6% *v* 5.0%, p<0.001) (table 1). Concordant UAI was usually with a main partner alone. By way of comparison, HIV positive men were just as likely to report